

RESTRICTED  
MANAGEMENT-IN-CONFIDENCE

g) Action 1.7 - DMS(N) to inform Mr Pearson SM511 of DREADNOUGHT survey arrangements. The Chairman reported this as being in hand.

Action 1.7 - DMS(N)

h) Action 1.8 - SM511 to arrange production of statement of requirements for internal survey of pressure hull of DREADNOUGHT. In hand. Survey was under discussion with SM513 and SM557.

Action 1.8 - SM511

i) Action 1.9 - See action 1.3.

j) Action 1.10 - Subs 11 and Nall2 to comment on afloat storage feasibility paper. Complete.

Sea Bed Storage

4. Mr Chandler reported that the first and second drafts of the feasibility paper had been commented on by all parties. Comments on the second draft would be used as the basis of discussion for the meeting. SM611 written comments (SSCIMS SM611/820/02 dated 3 Apr 89) received by SM505 prompted discussion on the following aspects:

a) Sea Bed Depth:- Mr Chandler considered that 150m would be the minimum depth the submarines should be stored to avoid 'recreational' divers.

b) RC Waterfill:- Mr Evans had proposed that water-filling the RC would not be appropriate due to his concern over degradation during the storage period. Mr Chandler said that he did not feel that limited corrosion of the RC interior would present a problem and with a dry primary loop, protection of the primary plant would be assured.

c) Dry Pressure Hull:- Although desirable, a dry pressure hull would not be practicable at the planned storage depth. Mr Evans's suggestion of balancing hydrostatic forces by pressurising the hull with air at the surface was considered by the meeting to be too dangerous in case of brittle failure of the hull.

5. Mr Briscoe (representing ADNA/SM) reported that generally CNA were content with the feasibility paper. However, although not affecting the content of the paper, CNA believed that non-ferrous metals in the submarines should be removed where possible to reduce corrosion; the meeting agreed with this approach.

6. Endorsement of the Feasibility Paper:- The Chairman summarised the position with respect to the endorsement of the second draft feasibility paper:

a) SM505 would seek DNP endorsement directly from DNP/SM611.

b) ADIC/SM511 had endorsed the paper.

c) CNA/Nall2 had endorsed the paper (with the proviso that further detailed studies would be required before a full degree of confidence could be assured).

d) DGSR/Subs 11 had endorsed the paper.

e) DNSy comments would be handled directly by Sec(FS)/A.